



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,811	10/19/2000	Stanley W. Olson	BERG-2550/C2719	5391

7590 05/22/2002

John P Donohue Jr Esq
Woodcock Washburn Kurtz
Mackiewicz & Norris LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/691811

Applicant(s)

Examiner

N. Abrams

Group Art Unit

2839

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4-19-02 (RCE and prelim amt)
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8-10, 12-20, 25-36, 38-41 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8-10, 12-20, 25-36, 38-41 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

The request for contained examination (RCE) is acknowledged.

A first action follows.

The objection to the abstract is repeated.

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-20, 25-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaudenzi ^{taken} alone or in view of LaVasco and Dozier.

See last office action.

Obvious to form Gaudenzi fig. 8, pins 58 with stops to prevent over insertion.

Claims 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dozier in view of LoVasco.

See last office action.

Note that claim 25 does not require the "hold down" feature.

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-20, 25-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dozier in view of Gaudenzi and LoVasco.

See last office action.

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

While Gaudenzi teaches away from use of hold down pins with stops, the patent does indicate such feature to be a known option. Therefore to select to use the Gaudenzi system but with the pins swaged or otherwise shaped from stops would have been an obvious variation.

Serial Number: 09/691,811

Page 3

Art Unit: 2839

For example if the added cost were found not critical or if the mounted item were heavier than usual it would have been within the scope of Gradenzi teachings, col, 6, lines 20-25 to ~~arise~~^{use} pins with stops to prevent over insertion and to prevent solder ball~~d~~ damage.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at telephone number (703) 308-1729.

Abrams/ds

05/18/02


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322